DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 213 744 TM 820 152

AUTHOR Oman, Ray C.
TITLE The Nature and Conduct of Management Evaluation Studies and the Acceptance of Recommendations by Decision Makers.
PUB DATE Oct 81
NOTE 39p.; Paper presented at the Joint Meeting of the Evaluation Network and Evaluation Research Society (Austin, TX, October 1-3, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administration; *Decision Making; Evaluation Methods; *Federal Government; Organizational Change
IDENTIFIERS Empirical Methods; Evaluation Problems; *Evaluation Utilization; *Management Analysis

ABSTRACT

Although there is considerable discussion and speculation about decision makers' acceptance and utilization of evaluation findings, little empirical research has been conducted on the subject. The purpose of this research effort is to help fill that void by examining the degree to which findings are accepted and the factors which influence acceptance, based on empirically gathered data. This research effort describes management analysis and evaluation studies conducted within Federal agencies and factors related to the acceptance of study recommendations. The research results will add to the body of knowledge about the kinds of studies conducted by management evaluators, the methods and techniques used in the conduct of the studies, and the degree to which study recommendations are accepted by decision makers. Typologies have been developed to provide a framework for analyzing the relationship between the kinds of studies and the methods used, and the acceptance of recommendations. The research effort brings together the themes of analysis and evaluation studies, decisionmaking, and organization change. (The findings indicated in this paper are based on a preliminary and partial analysis of six management evaluations. A complete analysis of 20 management evaluation studies will be completed in April, 1982.) (Author/GK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED213744

The Nature and Conduct of Management Evaluation Studies and the Acceptance of Recommendations by Decision Makers

by

Ray C. Oman

Program Analyst

U. S. Department of Agriculture

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R.C. Oman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The Joint Meeting of Evaluation Network and Evaluation Research Society

Austin, Texas

October 1-3, 1981

TM 820 152

Table of Contents

	Page
Summary	1
PART I. Research Proposal	2
Introduction	2
The Nature of Management Evaluations	7
Methods Used in Conducting Management Evaluations	8
The Nature of Recommendation in Management Evaluations	10
The Acceptance of Study Recommendations	12
A Literature Review About Factors Affecting the Acceptance of Recommendations	12
The Relationship Between the Kinds of Studies and the Methods Used and the Acceptance of Recommendations	16
Selection of Agencies	20
Selection of a Sampling of Management Analyses/Evaluation Studies for Examination	22
Data Summary and Analysis	23
PART II. Presentation of Preliminary Findings	24
TABLE 1. Acceptance of Recommendations	25
TABLE 2. A Comparison of the Kind of Study and the Acceptance of Recommendations	26-27
TABLE 3. A Comparison of Characteristices and Level of Acceptance of Individual Recommendations	28
Bibliography	29

Summary

Although there is considerable discussion and speculation about decision makers' acceptance and utilization of evaluation findings, little empirical research has been conducted on the subject. The purpose of this research effort is to help fill that void by examining the degree to which findings are accepted and the factors which influence acceptance, based on empirically gathered data.

This research effort describes management analysis and evaluation studies conducted within Federal agencies and factors related to the acceptance of study recommendations. The research results will add to the body of knowledge about the kinds of studies conducted by management evaluators, the methods and techniques used in the conduct of the studies, and the degree to which study recommendations are accepted by decision makers. Typologies have been developed to provide a framework for analyzing the relationship between the kinds of studies and the methods used, and the acceptance of recommendations. The research effort brings together the themes of analysis and evaluation studies, decisionmaking, and organization change. (The findings indicated in this paper are based on a preliminary and partial analysis of six management evaluations. A complete analysis of 20 management evaluation studies will be completed in April, 1982.)

PART I- RESEARCH PROPOSAL

Introduction

Efforts by the Executive Office of the President to improve management in the Federal Government have not succeeded very well. During the past two decades, one reform effort led to another as Planning-Programming-Budgeting System (PPBS) gave way to Management by Objectives (MBO) which in turn has been replaced by Zero Based Budgeting (ZBB). Other recent attempts to alter and improve practices of Federal managers include "Sunset Legislation," an emphasis on productivity measurement and program evaluation, and the Merit Pay and Senior Executive Service systems.

Despite these attempts to use a rational approach to decisionmaking as a way of improving management, the public's confidence in the Government has eroded in the past decade. Brought on, perhaps, by the was in Vietnam and the shock of Watergate, confidence is at a low level. The public's belief in a well-managed Government is at a nadir typified by a broadbased support of Proposition 13. Politicians and top Federal administrators alike have joined with others in criticizing the management of the Government bureaucracy.

While the difficulties with implementing PPBS and MBO are well documented and incipient research describes the serious implementation problems with ZBB, little attention has focused on the agencies own efforts to change and improve their management practices. Government organizations at the department and bureau levels employ individuals who are charged with improving efficiency and effectiveness within their organizations. Functions include improving management decisions, procedures, processes, and systems.

Agencies' own efforts at changing and improving management practices are obviously on a much smaller scale than PPBS or ZBB. Yet, there are many similarities between these organization change efforts mandated for the entire

executive branch and the efforts that occur in any individual department or bureau. Some of the areas of similarity are as follows: (1) management evaluation efforts generally take a rational analytical approach; (2) one person (the analyst/evaluator) is trying to effect a change in another person or group of personnel; (3) a formal study is conducted and a written report produced; and (4) the analyst/evaluator conducting the study is from the staff rather than the line part of the organization.

Within the Federal Government, there are a number of job series which are concerned with providing information and analysis for better management decisions. These include economists, industrial engineers, management analysts and evaluators, operations research analysts, and program analysts and evaluators. Management analysts and evaluators comprise the job series that is charged with improving organization efficiency and effectiveness and are the focus of this research. There are over 10,000 management analysts (MAs) in the Federal Government and more than 4,000 in the Washington, DC, SMSA. Management evaluation efforts are concerned with improving decisions about a wide range of programmatic, organization, and administrative questions.

Although management analysts/evaluators are involved in thousands of studies to improve decision making and to alter management practices each year, a search of the literature has revealed no information about the kinds of topics studies, the methods used in the conduct of the studies, or the degree of acceptance and implementation of study findings. Thus, this sizable group of evaluators charged with assessing efficiency and effectiveness may be an untapped source of information about analysis and evaluation activities and implementing change in the Federal Government.

Literature from program evaluation, a field closely related to management evaluation, suggests there are serious problems with the decision makers acceptance of study findings. For example, Joseph Wholey in his article, "What Can We Actually Get from Program Evaluation," writes:

> .....we have all learned that evaluation is difficult, takes a lot of time to carry out, and can be very expensive. We have discovered that the information generated by evaluation studies is often incomplete, suspect, and unrelated to the problems at hand. We have found bureaucratic and organizational constraints so formidable that today, after investment of significant resources and effort, not one federal agency has the overall evaluation system and few programs are able to make any use of the evaluations produced. On the whole, federal evaluation efforts have not been cost effective in terms of impact on policy and program development.[1]

Cox, in his article, "Managerial Style: Implications for the Utilization of Program Evaluation Information", summarizes the problems associated with utilization. Some of the major problems are:

(1) The difference between the roles and styles of agency personnel and evaluators inhibits their ability to communicate, cooperate, and work together.

(2) Program evaluation studies are not rigorous enough to be convincing.

(3) Evaluation factors are not as important as other factors, such as political issues.

(4) Evaluation results are not communicated to agency personnel in such a way that they can be useful.[2]

The difficulty program evaluators have had affecting organization decision

---

[1] Policy Sciences, Volume 3, 1972, pp. 361-369.

[2] Evaluation Quarterly, Volume 1, No. 3, August, 1977, pp. 499-509.

processes had been documented by Adams (1975)[3] Davis and Salasin (1975)[4], Riecken (1972)[5], Suchman (1967)[6], Weiss (1972)[7], (1973)[8], and Windle and Bates (1974)[9].

---

[3]Adams, Stuart, Evaluation Research in Corrections: A Practical Guide, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, U.S. Government Printing Office, March, 1975.

[4]Davis, Howard R. and Salasin, Susan E., "The Utilization of Evaluations," in Handbook of Evaluation Research, by Elmer L. Struening and Marcia Guttentaz, (eds.), Beverly Hills, Sage Publications, Vol. I, 1975, pp. 621-666.

[5]Riecken, Henry W., "Memorandum on Program Evaluations" in Evaluating Active Programs by Carol Weiss, Boston, Allyn, and Bacon, 1972, pp. 85-104.

[6]Suchman, Edward A., Evaluation Research, New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1967.

[7]Weiss, Carol H., "Utilization of Evaluation - Toward Comparative Sucy," in Evaluating Active Programs, Carol Weiss, ed., Boston, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1972.

[8]Weiss, Carol, "Between the Cup and the Lip", Evaluation, Boston, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., Volume 1, No. 2, 1973, pp. 49-55.

[9]Windle, Charles and Bates, Peter, "Evaluating Program Evaluations," in Evaluations of Behavorial Programs in Community, Residential, and School Settings, by Park O. Davidson and Frank W. Clark. Champaign, Illinois, Research Press, 1974.

The Nature of Management Evaluations

A typology has been developed to provide a framework for analyzing evaluation studies. The classification scheme includes the following factors: (1) purpose of the study; (2) topical content area of the study; (3) initiator of the study; (4) organizational location of the unit studies; (5) organizational location of the MA unit; and (6) the prospective or retrospective nature of the study. The six factors and several sub-factors which comprise the typology will allow MA studies to be placed in a framework which facilitates their examination. The typology is a preliminary classification scheme which may be modified during the data collection or analysis phase of the research process.

The typology consists of the following factors and sub-factors:

A typology of the kinds of management analysis/evaluation studies.

1. Purpose of the Study
   (a) assist in making a specific decision
   (b) provide general assistance in defining a problem and making a decision about it
   (c) gain acceptance for a decision in one part of the organization when that decision was made in another part of the organization

2. Topical Content Area
   (a) work methods and procedures
   (b) systems
   (c) personnel utilization and staffing requirements
   (d) productivity and performance measurement
   (e) cost analysis and benefit/cost analysis
   (f) organization placement and structure
   (g) administrative/management policy
   (h) interpersonal relationships and behavioral science
   (i) general review or survey

3. Initiator of the Study
   (a) top agency or bureau management
   (b) top administrative management
   (c) top program management
   (d) the unit studies, itself
   (e) the MA unit, itself
   (f) a combination

4. Organization Location Where the Study Was Conducted
   (a) a function located organizationally in administrative management
   (b) an administrative function located organizationally unted a program area
   (c) a program function located organizationally under a program area
   (d) bureau or agency-wide

5. Organizational Location of the Management Analysis (MA) Unit
   (a) under administrative management
   (b) under agency or bureau top management
   (c) under a program area

6. Nature of the Study
   (a) prospective analysis, future oriented
   (b) retrospective evaluation
   (c) a combination of (a) and (b)

Methods Used in Conducting Management Evaluations

A second classification scheme has been developed to analyze the methods used in the conduct of the studies. The term "methods" is defined broadly to include the tools, techniques, processes, and activities associated with the study. Phrased differently, the research question asks, "In what ways were studies conducted?" Information about the ways studies were conducted will be gathered from a number of sources including interviews with the analyst involved, written study reports, and working papers and backup material developed in the conduct of the study.

The "way the study was conducted" can be viewed in terms of "content" and "process." "Content" refers to the activities undertaken in the study. These activities often approximate the steps associated with the scientific method; that is, the problem was defined, data were collected, the data were analyzed and interpreted, and conclusions and recommendations were developed. Another aspect of the content is the specific techniques used to gather and analyze data. For example, data could be collected from a work sampling and statistics such as a mean, median, mode, and standard deviation computed to allow comparisons among the units studied.

"Process" refers to the way the "content" activities of the study were carried out. "Process" deals with who was involved in making decisions about and in carrying out the various study activities. For example, MA studies can be conducted by one analyst; by a group composed of management analyst, a statistics consultant, and a representative of the unit being studied; or by a task team comprised of a management analyst, an expert in productivity measurement, and three division chiefs from the units being studied.

The following framework has been developed to assist in collecting and analyzing information about the methods used by analysts in conducting MA studies. The framework is tentative and may be modified during the data collection or analysis phase of the research process.

	Content	Process
I. Problem Definition:	1. What was the problem?	1. Who asked for the study?
	2. What was the purpose of the study?	2. Who defined the problem?
	3. Was the problem structured?	3. By what process was the problem defined?
II. Information (Data) Collection	1. What methods were used in information collection?	1. Who collected the information (data)?
	2. What kind of information was collected?	2. How was it decided what information should be collected?
III. Information (Data) Analysis and Interpretation	1. How was the information ordered, analyzed and interpreted?	1. Who ordered, analyzed, and interpreted the data?
	2. What methods were used to order, analyze, and interpret the data?	2. How was it decided how the data would be ordered, analyzed, and interpreted?
IV. Development of Conclusions and Recommendations	1. What conclusions and recommendations were developed?	1. Who developed the conclusions and recommendations?
	2. What was the basis for the conclusions and recommendations?	2. By what "process" were the conclusions and recommendations developed?

Answers to the above questions may provide the basis for classifying studies in two sets of factors related to study methodology: (1) solitary - participatory and (2) scientific - political.

The Nature of Management Evaluation Recommendations

A framework has also been developed to classify the individual recommendations that are presented in studies. The classification scheme is based on the following six factors: (1) subject, (2) scope, (3) type, (4) complexity, (5), specificity, and (6) degree of change from the status quo. A separate typology presented earlier in this proposal classified the kinds of studies. However, in examining the acceptance of recommendations, there is a need to analyze the individual recommendations, in addition to the study which represents the general context within which the recommendation was made. The nature of the recommendations contained in a study is related to the kind of study, but it is more specific.

This typology of the kinds of recommmendations will allow each recommendation in a study to be placed within a framework and to be examined separately. Thus, the kind of recommendations will be related to the kind of study, the methods used, and the degree of acceptance of the recommendation. Each of the six categories in the typology represents a factor which could have affected the recommendations' acceptance.

Sources of information include: interviews with analysts and decision makers, written study reports, and backup materials developed in the study.

A. Typology of Kinds of Recommendations

I. Subject:

equipment and hardware technology
work methods and procedures
systems
organization structure and functions
personnel
training
physical place (or space)
delegation of authority or responsibility
interpersonal behavior
decision making

II. Scope: Number of people or organization units affected
few - section
branch
division
major operating unit
bureau
more than one bureau
department (agency)
many - more than one department (agency)

III. Type:
context
process

IV. Complexity:
low
medium
high

V. Specificity:
low
medium
high

VI. Degree of Change from the Status Quo:
low
medium
high

The Acceptance of Study Recommendations by Decision Makers

Information about the acceptance of study recommendations will be collected in interviews with the analysts who conducted the studies and with the managers responsible for accepting the recommendations. Written documentation attesting to the acceptance or rejection of recommendations frequently exists. As a result of this process, the following summary information will be developed: (1) the total number of recommendations, (2) the number of recommendations not accepted, (3) the number of recommendations accepted in part, and (4) the number of recommendations accepted in total.

A Literature Review About Factors Affecting the Acceptance of Recommendations

A review of the literature about factors affecting the implementation of change in organizations has revealed four subject areas containing relevent sources. These areas are program evaluation, management science, applied behavioral science, and organization theory. The three areas that are most closely related to the management analysis and evaluation function in the Federal Government are management science, program evaluation, and applied behavioral science. Organization theory is a more theoretical inquiry which is taught in colleges and universities but often without the perspective of practitioners case studies or empirical research.

Some of the writings about utilization that are relevant to management analysis are discussed in the following paragraphs. In the program evaluation literature Gary B. Cox uses Mintzberg's theory of managerial behavior to relate managerial style to the problem of implementing study findings. These problems include:

- a mismatch between the roles and styles of agency personnel and evaluators
- studies that are insufficiently rigorous to be convincing
- too much methodological sophistication and too little concern with concrete aspects of the program

- results are not availabe in time to be useful for decision making
- answers are provided to questions in which managers have no interest
- political and funding issues are often more important that evaluation results, and
- evaluation findings are not communicated to agency personnel in ways that they can be used.[10]

The article by Cox is particularly relevant to management evaluation studies because it relates the perspective of the manager (decision maker) to that of the evaluator.

Levitan and Hughes in a recent study discuss five major concepts which existing research consistently relate to utilization. These concepts are: (1) relevance to program and policy concerns, (2) good communication between the producers and consumers of evaluation, (3) the consumer's discussion and serious consideration of the results and their implication, (4) the credibility and trustworthiness of the evaluation, and (5) user involvement and adocacy.[11]

Carlotta J. Young, in a research paper on evaluation utilization developed for the General Accounting Office, identified six factors in the literature associated with utilization. They are as follows:

- the political decision making environment
- organization aspects of the management enviornment
- the commitment and involvement of decision makers and evaluators

---

[10] Cox, Gary B., "Managerial Style: Implications for the Utilization of Program Evaluation Information," Evaluation Quarterly, August 1977, pp. 499-509.

[11] Levitan, Laura C. and Edward F. X. Hughes, "Utilization of Evaluation: A Review and Synthesis", Working Paper #35, Departmet of Psychology, Evaluation, and Methodology and Center for Health Services and Policy Research, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, January, 1980, pp. 16-31.

- the appropriateness of the research questions
- methodology, and
- dissemination and reporting issues[12]

An examination of the evaluation literature reveals many sources listing factors which affect utilization. Few of the hypothesized factors, however, are examined in any detail. As Patton argues,

> the issue at this time is not the search for a single formula of utilization success, nor the generation of ever-longer lists of possible factors affecting utilization. The task for the present is to identify and define a few key variables that may make a major difference in a ssignificant number of evaluation cases.[13]

Following Patton's suggestion, the appraoch is this research effort is to focus on a few key factors, namely, the kind of study, the nature of the recommendations, and the methodology used in the conduct of the study.

There are a number of sources in program evaluation literature that pertain directly to the research questions in this proposal. Stuart Adams in developing a prescriptive package for evaluation research in corrections found that "weaker" research designs were more successful in effecting organization change. Adams concludes that the biggest payoffs come from "weak" or nonrigorous research designs, such as case studies and surveys. Adams goes on tc note that:

---

[12]Young, Carlotta J., "Evaluation Research," a paper presented at the Evaluation Research Society Second Annual Meeting, Washington, DC, November 2-4, 1978.

[13]Patton, Michael Q. et al., "In Search of Impact: An Analysis of the Utilization of Federal Health Evaluation Research," in Carol H. Weiss (ed.), Using Social Research in Public Policy Making, Lexington, Mass., Lexington Books, 1977.

> Although the reasons for this are not fully understood, some hypotheses may be stated: (a) these non-rigorous styles better fit the decisionmaking styles and needs of administrators; (b) there is greater pressure on corrections for system improvement than for client improvement, and these studies provide adequate rationales for system change; (c) in times of rapid change, conditions are not favorable for the use of strong research designs; and (d) correctional administrators have not yet supported rigorous designs to the extent required to make then generally effective.[14]

In addition to the research design aspect of methodology, the degree of decision maker participation in the evaluation, is another area to be explored in this research. Although participation is often listed as one of many factors affecting the utilization of evaluation findings, the degree or nature of participation is seldom defined or examined. A study by John D. Waller, et al, however, appears to place user involvement in the forefront of other factors. The report concludes that:

> The only characteristic of an evaluation system associated with utility was the degree of involvement of the user in an evaluation activity.....[15]

Mark van de Vall has done research about the effect of methodology and user participation on utilization of applied social science and social policy findings. Van de Vall and Bolas concluded that:

The impact of social policy research upon organizational decisions is higher when the research sponsor and research consumer are identical or closely linked, rather than consisting of two separate and independent organizations; and projects of social policy research accompanied by a steering committee consisting representatives from the research team, the research sponsor and researcher consumers(s) tend to score higher on policy impact than promects

---

[14] Adams, Stuart, Evaluate Research in Corrections: A Practical Guide, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, G.P.O., March, 1975, p. 115.

[15] Waller, John D., et al, Developing Useful Evaluation Capability: Lesson's From the Model Evaluation Program, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, G. P. O., June 1979, p. 11.

lacking a steering committee.[16]

Van de Vall, Bolas, and Kang examined the effect of methodology on the use of research finding in the area of industrial and labor relation in the Netherlands. Some of their conclusions which provide useful backgroumd information for this research effort are:

(1) The use of qualitive methods in applied social research leads to a higher impact upon indurtrial policy making than using quantitive methods particularly, tabular analysis.

(2) The more the methodological mixture of applied social research favors qualitive methods, the more intensively the projects are utilized in company policies.[17]

The Relationship Between the Kinds of Studies and the Methods Used and the Acceptance of Recommendations.

Factors affecting the acceptance of recommendations are of two kinds; (a) small scale, micro factors which are partially in the realm of the analysts' control and (b) larger organization or micro factors which are outside of the control of the analyst performing the study. The focus of this research effort is on the small scale, micro factors.

---

[16]Van de Vall, Mark D. and Cheryl Bolas, "The Utilization of Social Policy Research: An Empirical Analysis of It's Structure and Functions, "74th Annual Meeting of the Socialogical Society, Boston, Mass., August 27-31, 1979.

[17]Van de Vall, Mark, Cheryl Bolas, and Tai S. Kang, "Applied Social Research in Industrial Organizations: An Evaluation of Functions, Theory, and Methods," The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Volume 12, Number 2, April-May-June, 1976, pp. 172-173.

Micro factors in the larger organization environment influencing the acceptance of study findings include budget cuts or increments in funding, changes in personnel ceilings and hiring freezes, and reorganizations and other changes in the "caste of characters". Factors in the larger organization environment can affect the demand for certain kinds of and the acceptability of recommendations. For example, in times of personnel or budget cuts, recommendations dealing with cost/effectiveness, cost reduction, and the streamlining of procedures are likely to be viewed more favorably than in times of expansion.

Micro factors, the focus of this effort, include dimensions such as the way decisions were made about how the study would be conducted, the kind of information (data) collected, who collected the information, how the information (data) was analyzed and interpreted, and how recommedations were developed. Micro factors also include the characteristics of the kind of study conducted such as the purpose of the study, the topical content, the initiator, and the retrospective or prospective emphasis. The analyst may or may not be in a position to control or alter a number of these factors.

Some working hypotheses have been developed for examining the relationships between the kinds of studies and the ways they are conducted and the acceptance of recommendations by decision makers. The following paragraphs discuss a few of these hypothesized relationships.

Purpose of the Study: The probability of accepting recommendations is likely to be greater when the MA assists in a specific decision than when the analyst is asked to provide general assistance in problem diagnosis and decision making. This hyphoteses is suggested because the selection of a course of action to solve a problem is further along in the problem solving process than diagnosis.

Initiator of the Study: Who initiates the study can influence the likelihood of recommedations being accepted. A number of relationships can be suggested. For example, the probability of recommedations being accepted is greatest when the initiator or requester of the study is head of the unit targeted study. The more organization levels that separate the requestor of the study from direct supervisory responsibility for the unit proposed for study, the lower the probability of recommedations being accepted. In other words, the likelihood of accepting recommendations is greatest when the person requesting the study is the same person responsible for accepting or rejecting recommedations. The higher up in the formal and informal organization the initiator is located the better. The larger the number of people responsible for accepting recommendations, the lower the likelihood of acceptance.

Organization Location Where the Study Was Conducted and Organization Location of the MA Unit: The relative organization location of the MA unit and of divisions throughout the organization which MA's study may be viewed laterally and vertically. Similar organizations are grouped together laterally, while place in the formal organization hierarchy is depicted vertically. Organizational location is a surrogate for factors such as communication and power, which may influence the likelihood of the acceptance of recommedations. Thus, management evaluations are apt to have better acceptance in units with which the evaluators have frequent communication and interaction or in which they are perceived as powerful.

Study Methods: The methods used in conducting a study may also affect the likelihood of managers accepting recommendations. The methods used in the conduct of the study or "the way the study was conducted," may be viewed in terms of "content" and "process". "Content" refers to the actual methods used in carrying out the study and "process" refers to the way decisions were made about what methods would be used.

A framework has been developed to analyze information about study methods based on a distillation of the literature and the researcher's experience. The framework is based on two sets of concepts: (1) scientific - political, and (2) solitary - participative. The "scientific" and "political" approaches are not mutually exclusive. A study with a poorly developed methodology could use little of either approach. On the other hand, a study could be characterized by the use of both methodologies.

Information collected about how each study was conducted will allow each study to be placed within this framework. The information that is collected about the "content" of the way the study was conducted will allow it to be placed on scales for "scientific" and "political". Studies, for example, that were characterized by the definition of variables and the use of models and statistical analysis to arrive at study conclusions would be considered on the scientific side of the scale. Studies in which decisions about conclusions and recommendations were made by the judgement of one or more persons would be placed toward the political end of the scale.

Information about the "process" of the way the study is conducted will allow it to be placed on a graduated scale extending from "solitary" to participative". For example, studies where the analyst alone made all of the decisions about how the study would be carried out would be rated on the "solitary" side of the scale. However, studies in which decisions about how to carry out the study were made by consultation between the analyst and the person(s) responsible for accepting or rejecting the recommendations would be rated toward the "participative" end.

Two hypotheses about the relationship between the methods used in the conduct of the study and the acceptance of recommendations by decision makers are: (1) studies in which recommedations are arrived at by "political" methods will have a higher degree of acceptance than those in which recommendations are arrived at by "scientific" methods and (2) studies which are carried out in a "participative" way will have a higher degree of acceptance of recommedations than those which are carried out in a "solitary fashion.

The relationship between (a) the kinds of studies and (b) the methods used in the conduct of these studies and (c) the degree to which recommendations are accepted will be explored in a systematic fashion. Information about these three sets of factors will be quantified where possible. When quantification is not possible or appropriate, relationships will be described in narrative fashion.

Selection of Agencies

Management analyses and evaluations are conducted in virtually all organizations in the Federal Government. All departments, nearly all bureaus, and most independent agencies have management analysis units. Those organizations that are too small to warrant their own management analysts sometines consult with organizations with large numbers of analysts such as the Office of Personnel Management, the Office of Management and Budget, and the General Accounting Office.

For the purpose of this research, the twelve cabinet level civilian departments (with all of their bureaus) and the independent agencies of the General Services Administration (GSA), the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), and the Veterans Administration (VA) have been selected as the organizational entities from which particular studies will be chosen. GSA, NASA, and VA were selected from among the independent agencies because they have relatively larger numbers of management analysts.

MA Units with 6 or More Analysts In the Washington, DC, SMSA

	Number of MA Units										TOTAL
	1.	2.	3.	3.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	
VA	X	X									2
NASA	X	X									2
GSA	X	X	X	X							4
Treasury	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				8
Transportation	X	X	X	X	X	X					6
State	X	X									2
Labor	X	X	X	X	X	X					6
Justice	X	X	X	X	X	X					6
Energy	X										1
Interior	X	X	X	X	X	X					6
HUD	X	X	X								3
Health & Human Services	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	10
Education	X	X									2
Commerce	X	X	X	X	X	X					6
Agriculture	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	10

Selection of a Sampling of Management Analysis/Evaluation Studies for Examination

Several criteria will be used in selecting the particular studies to be examined. The major research question is, "How do the kinds of managment evaluation studies and the ways they are conducted relate to the acceptance of study recommendations for change in the Federal Government?" The purpose in selecting a sample of MA studies to get a distribution of studies which can be examined for any relationships between the kinds of study conducted, the methods used in their conduct, and likelihood of accepting and implementing recommendations.

The criteria for selecting studies are grouped under the two factors of (1) relevance to the research question and (2) accessibility of information. The criteria are as follows:

(1) relevance to the research question

a. the purpose of the study should have been to assist in decision making;
b. the study should be completed and sufficient time should have elapsed for information about the acceptances and implementation of recommendations to be available;
c. the study should have been of a substantive subject large enough in scope or depth that it would require a considerable amount of time and effort; and
d. the study should have been completed within the last year or two.

(2) accessibility of information

a. the analyst who conducted the study and who is familiar with the details should be available for interview;
b. a written report should have been developed as part of the study;
c. the MA unit head and the analyst who conducted the study should be willing to identify the person responsible for accepting the recommendations.
d. the person responsible for accepting the recommendations should be available for interview.

The largest study meeting these criteria will be selected for examination. It is estimated that a minimum of three interviews will need to be conducted for each MA study to be examined in light of the research questions.

The first interview will be conducted with the head of the MA unit to review studies that have been completed and to select one for further examination. Secondly, an in-depth interview with the analyst who conducted the study will be carried out. A copy of the study report will be reviewed before the interview with the analyst (s) who conducted the study. Last, the decision maker(s) who was responsible for accepting and implementing the recommendation will be interviewed. More than one interview will normally have to be conducted with the analyst who directed the study.

Data Summary and Analysis

Qualitative and quantitative data and analysis will be used to answer the research questions. Most of the information collected in interviews regarding the kinds of studies, the way they were conducted, and the acceptance of recommendations will be qualitative and descriptive in nature. People's opinions, views, annd impressions expressed verablly are expected to povide rich insights about the research question.

The research is also designed to gather and analyze quantitative information. Several typologies have been developed to allow interviewees' verbally expressed views and opinions to be grouped and summarized numerically. In addition, some to the data gathering instruments consist of numerical scales to be completed by interviewees. The quantitative information that is collected will allow summary statistics, such as frequency distributions annd measures of central tendency including the mean, mediam, mode, and range, to be computed. Depending on the quality of numerical information that is gathered, it may be possible to express some to the relationships statistically using Chi-square and some form of correlation analysis.

PART-II PRESENTATION OF PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

The following tables summarize the partial annd preliminary finding for six management evaluation studies examined thus far. An in-depth analysis of 20 management evaluation studies will be completd by April, 1982.

Table 1

The Degree of Acceptance of Recommendations for Six Management Evaluation Studies

Bureau/Agency	Totally Accepted	Partially Accepted	Not Accepted	Total Number of Recommendations
A	2 (29)	2 (29)	3 (42)	7
B	24 (73)	4 (12)	5 (15)	33
C	2 (100)			2
D	22 (88)		3 (12)	25
E			7 (100)	7
F	5 (71)		2 (29)	7
Total	55 (68)	6 (7)	20 (25)	81

*Percentages are indicated in parentheses

Table 2

Comparison of the Kinds of Studies and the Acceptance of Recommendations*

	Number of Recommendations			Total Number of Recommendations
	Totally Accepted	Partially Accepted	Not Accepted	
1. Purpose of the Study				
(a) assist in making a specific decision	2 (100)			2
(b) provide general assistance in defining a problem and making about it	53 (67)	6 (8)	20 (25)	79
(c) gain acceptance for a decision made in one part of the organization in another part	-	-	-	-
	55	6	20	81
2. Topical Content Area				
(a) work systems, management systems	2 (29)	2 (29)	3 (42)	7
(a) work methods and rocedures	27 (84)	-	5 (16)	32
(b) systems (automated)	-	-	-	-
(c) personnel utilization and staffing requirements	2 (100)	-	-	2
(d) productivity and performance measurement	-	-	-	-
(e) cost analysis and benefit/cost analysis	-	-	-	-
(f) organization placement, organization structure	24 (60)	4 (10)	12 (30)	40
(g) policy	-	-	-	-
(h) interpersonal relationships and behavioral science	-	-	-	-
(i) general review or survey	-	-	-	-
	55	6	20	81
3. Initiator of the Study				
(a) top agency or bureau management	22 (88)	-	3 (12)	25
(b) top administrative management	5 (36)	-	9 (64)	14
(c) top program mangement	-	-	-	-
(d) the unit studied, itself	24 (73)	4 (12)	5 (15)	33
(e) the MA unit, itself	2 (29)	2 (29)	3 (42)	7
(f) a combination	-	-	-	-
(g) top admin. mgt. in program areas	2 (100)	-	-	2
	55	6	20	81

4. Organization Location Where the Study Was Conducted				
(a) a function located organizationally in Administrative management	5 (71)	-	2 (29)	7
(b) an administrative function located organizationally under a program Area	2 (100)	-	-	2
(c) a program function located organizationally under a Program Area	24 (75)	2 (6)	6 (19)	32
(d) bureau or agency wide	24 (60)	4 (10)	12 (30)	40
	55	6	20	81
5. Organization Location of the Management Analysis (MA) Unit				
(a) under Administrative Management	55 (68)	6 (7)	20 (25)	81
(b) under agency or bureau top management	-	-	-	-
(c) under a Program Area	-	-	-	-
6. Nature of the Study				
(a) prospective analysis, future oriented	48 (72)	4 (6)	15 (22)	67
(b) retrospective evaluation	2 (29)	2 (29)	3 (42)	7
(c) a combination of (a) and (b)	5 (71)	-	2 (29)	7
	55 (68)	6 (7)	20 (25)	81

*The numbers in parentheses are percentages.

Table 3

A Comparison of the Characteristics and Level of Acceptance
Individual Recommendations

	Number of Recommendations*		
	Accepted	Partially Accepted	Not Accepted
I. Subject content:			
equipment and hardware technology			
work methods and procedures	7 (64)		4 (26)
systems			
organization structure and functions	8 (42)	3 (16)	8 (42)
policy	10 (71)	1 (7)	3 (22)
personnel, staffing level	2 (100)		
training[physical place (or space)			
delegation of authority or responsbility	7 (78)		2 (22)
interpersonal behavior			
decision making			
management systems	18 (75)	2 (8)	4 (17)
program/budget	2 (100)		
I. Scope:			
number of people or organization units affected			
few - section			
branch	2 (100)		
division	26 (81)		6 (29)
major operating unit	22 (67)	4 (12)	5 (15)
bureau			
more than one bureau			
department (agency)			7 (100)
many - more than one department (agency)			
region of bureau	2 (28)	2 (28)	3 (42)
one office unit	2 (100)		
III. Type:			
content	45 (63)	6 (8)	21 (29)
process	9 (100)		
IV. Complexity:			
low	19 (79)	1 (4)	4 (17)
medium	28 (68)	5 (12)	8 (20)
high	7 (44)		9 (56)
V. Specificity:			
low	17 (85)	1 (5)	2 (10)
medium	29 (63)	3 (6)	14 (31)
high	8 (53)	2 (14)	5 (33)
VI. Degree of Change from the Status Quo:			
low	16 (84)		3 (16)
medium	32 (74)	4 (9)	7 (16)
high	6 (32)	2 (10)	11 (58)

*Numbers in parentheses are percentages

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackoff, Russell, "Unsuccessful Case Studies and Why," Operations Research, Vol. 8, 1960, pp. 259-263.

Adams, Stuart, Evaluation Research in Corrections: A Practical Guide, U. S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, U. S. Governement Printing Office, March, 1975.

Afzal, Mohammad, "Management Analysis: An Emerging Staff Function," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, June, 1962.

Archibald, K. A., "Three Views of the Expert's Role in Policymaking: Systems Analysis, Incrementalism, and the Clinical Approach," Policy Sciences, Vol. 1, 1970, pp. 73-86.

Argyris, Chris and Donald Schon, Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness, Washington, DC, Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977.

Baker, John K., "Making Staff Consulting More Effective," Harvard Business Review, Jan-Feb, 1969.

Bean, Alden Suydam, "Management Science - Client Relationships: Studies of Linking Mechanisms," unpublished dissertation, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, August, 1972.

Berger, Peter L. and Thomas Luckmann, The Social Construction of Reality, New York, Doubleday and Company, 1966.

Berkely, George E., The Administrative Revolution, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1971.

Bernstein, Ilene Nagel and Howard E. Freeman, Academic and Entreprenerial Research, The Consequences of Diversity in Federal Evaluation Studies, New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1975.

Chelimsky, Eleanor (ed.), Proceedings of a Symposium on the Use of Evaluation by Federal Agencies, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Metrek Division, Mitre Corporation, Report M. 77-39, March, 1979.

Comtois, Joseph D., "Program Evaluation: A Unifying Evaluation Framework," The Bureaucrat, Summer, 1981, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 18-24.

Cox, Gary B., "Managerial Style: Implications for the Utilization of Program Evaluation Information," Evaluation Quarterly, Vol. 1, No. 3, August, 1977, pp. 444-509.

Crozier, Michael, The Bureaucratic Phenomenon, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Davis, Howard R. and Susan E. Salasin, "The Utilization of Evaluation," in Handbook of Evaluation Research, by Elmer L. Struening and Marcia Guttentag, eds., Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Vol. I, 1975, pp. 621-666.

Downs, Anthony, "Some Thoughts on Giving People Economic Advice," American Behavioral Scientist, Vol. 9, No. 1, September, 1965, pp. 30-32.

Dror, Yehezkel, "Applied Social Science and Systems Analysis," Public Administration Review, September, 1967, pp. 109-132.

Dyckman, Thomas, "Management Implementation of Scientific Research: An Attitudinal Study," Management Science, Vol. XIII, 1967.

Etzioni, Amitai, "Two Appraoches to Organization Analysis," Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. V, No. 22, 1960, pp. 1-15.

Fisher, John E., "Do Federal Managers Manage," Public Administration Review, Vol. XXII, Spring, 1962, pp. 59-64.

Flanders, Loretta R., "Program Evaluation: Merging Practical and Methodological Consideration," The Bureaucrat, Vol. 7, No. 3, Fall, 1978, pp. 43-49.

Forester, John, "The Practice of Evaluation and Policy Analysis," Working Paper No. 257, Berkeley, Department of City and Regional Planning, University of California, July, 1975.

Glaser, Edward M. and Thomas E. Baker, "A Clinical Approach to Program Evaluation," Evaluation, Fall, 1972, pp. 54-59.

Grinnell, Sherm, "The Development of Creative Interprofessional Collaboration," (mimeo.), Case Western Reserve University, March, 1969.

Hammond, John S., "The Roles of the Manager and Management Scientist in Successful Implementation," Sloan Management Review, (M. I. T.), Vol. 15, No. 2, Winter, 1974, pp. 1-24.

Harvey, Jerry B., "Eight Myths OD Consultants Believe In ... and Die By," OD Practitioner, Vol. 7, No. 1, Feb., 1975, pp. 1-5.

Havens, Harry S., "Program Evaluation and Program Management," Public Administration Review, Vol. 41, No. 4, July/August, 1981, pp. 480-485.

Huymans, Jan, The Implemenation of Operations Research, New York, Wiley Interscience, 1970.

Kerlinger, Fred N., Foundations of Behavioral Research, (2nd ed.), New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1973.

Lawrence, Paul R., "How to Deal with Resistance to Change," Harvard Business Review, Jan-Feb, 1969, pp. 145-153.

Leonard, Herbert E., "A Study of the Scope and Organization of Management Analysis Programs in Federal Agencies," unpublished masters thesis, The American University, Washington, DC, Feb., 1965.

Levitan, Laura C. and Edward F. X. Hughes, "Utilization of Evaluation: A Review and Synthesis," Working Paper No. 35, Department of Psychology, Evaluation and Methodology Center for Health Services and Policy Research, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, January, 1980, pp. 16-31.

Lindblom, Charles E., "The Science of Muddling Through," Public Administration Review, Vol. 19, No. 2, Spring, 1959.

Maccoby, Michael, The Gamesman: The New Corporate Leaders, New York, Simon and Schuster, 1976.

Margulies, Newton, "Action Research and the Consultive Prcess," Business Perspectives, Fall, 1968, pp. 26-30.

Margulies, Newton and John Wallace, Organizational Change: Techniques and Applications, Glenview, Illinois, Scott, Foresman, & Co., 1973, pp. 22-43.

Marvin, Keith E., "Evaluation for the Congress and the State Legislatures: Can We Increase Its Use," paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Conference of State Legislatures, July 23-27, 1979.

Neilson, Victon G., "Input-Output Model and the Non-Use of Policy Analysis," in Management and Policy Science in American Government, by Michael J. White, et al., 1965.

Patton, Michael Quinn, Utilization Focused Evaluation, Beverly Hills, Sage Publications, 1975.

Patton, Michael W., et al., "In Search of Impact: An Analysis of Utilization of Federal Health Evaluation Research," in Carol H. Weiss (ed.), Using Social Research in Public Policy Making, Lexington, Mass., Lexington Books, 1977.

Quade, Edward S., Analysis for Public Decisions, New York, American Elsevier Publishing Company, 1975, pp. 253-267.

Radnor, Michael, A. H. Rubenstein and David Tansik, "Implementation of Operations Research in R&D in Government and Business Organizations," Operations Research, Vol. 18, Nov-Dec, 1970, pp. 967-991.

Rapp, William F., "Management Analysis at the Headquarters of Federal Agencies," International Review of Administrative Science, Vol. XXVI, No. 3, 1960, pp. 235-248.

Reisman, Arnold and Cornelius A. de Kluyer, "Strategies for Implementing Systems Studies," in Implementing Operations Research and Management Science, by Randall L. Schultz and Dennis P. Slevin, (eds.), 1975, pp. 291-300.

Reichen, Henry W., "Memorandum on Program Evaluations," in Evaluating Action Programs by Carol Weiss, Boston, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1972, pp. 85-104.

Schultz, Randall L. land Dennis P. Slevin (eds.), Implementating Operations Research and Management Science, New York, American Elsevier Co., 1975.

Schulberg, Herbert C. and Frank Baker, "Program Evaluations Models and the Implementation of Research Findings," American Journal of Public Health, Vol. 58, No. 7, July, 1968, pp. 1248-1255.

Silverman, David, The Theory of Organizations, New York, Basic Books Inc., 1971.

Sorenson, Richard E., "An Empirical Investigation of the Lewin-Schein Theory of Change and Its' Application," Ph. D. disseration, New York University, copyright by Richard E. Sorenson, 1973.

Suchman, Edward A., Evaluation Research, New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1967.

Tansik, David A., "Influence of Organization Goal Structures on the Selection and Implementation of Management Science Projects," in Management and Policy Sciences in American Government by Michael J. White, et al., 1965.

Tullock, Gordon, The Politics of Bureaucracy, Washington, DC, Public Affairs Press, 1965.

U. S. Agency Management Analysis Officers Group, "The General Management Analyst: A Concept of the Character of the Occupation," March, 1960.

U. S. Bureau of the Budget, "Management Analysis at the Headquarters of Federal Agencies: An Inventory of Agency Practices Concerning the Staff Function of Management Analysis," October, 1959.

U. S. Department of Commerce, Office of Organization and Management Systems, "Listing and Summary of Department of Commerce Management Reports, 1975-1977."

U. S. Office of Management and Budget, Resoruces for Management Analysis, Fiscal Year 1978.

_____, Resources for Program Evaluation, Fiscal Year 1977.

U. S. Office of Personnel Management, Qualfications Standards, TS 141, February, 1972.

Van de Vall, Mark D. and Cherly Bolas, "The Utilization of Social Policy Research: An Empirical Analysis of Its Structure and Functions," 74th Annual Meeting of the American Sociology Association, Boston, August 27-31, 1979.

Van de Vall, Mark D., Cheryl Bolas, and Tai S. Kang, "Applied Social Research in Industrial Organizations: An Evaluation of Functions, Theory, and Methods," The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Vol. 12, No. 2, April-May-June, 1976, pp. 159-177.

Vertlinsky, Ilan, Richard T. Barth, and Vance T. Mitchell, "A Study of OR/MS Implementation - a Social Change Process," in Operations Research and Management Science by Randall L. Schultz and Dennis Slevin (eds.), New York, American Elsevier Co., 1975, pp. 253-270.

Weiss, Carol H., "Utilization of Evaluation - Toward Comparative Study," in Evaluating Action Programs, Carol Weiss, ed., Boston, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1972.

_____, "Between the Cup and the Lip," Evaluation, Vol. 1, No. 2, 1973, pp. 49-55.

Waller, John D. et al., Developing Useful Evaluation Capability: Lessons From the Model Evaluation Program, U. S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, G. P. O., June, 1979.

White, Michael J., Michael Radnor, and David Tansik, Management and Policy Science in American Government, Lexington, Mass., Lexington Books, 1975.

_____, Management Science in Federal Agencies, Lexington, Mass., D. C. Heath & Co., 1975.

_____, "Analysis vs. Bargaining," Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., prepared for American Society for Public Administration Conference, Denver, April 18-21, 1971, for the panel addressing "Dilemas of Policy Making in a Pluralistic Society."

_____, "Operations Research, Organization Theory, and Public Policy Making," Cooperative International Program of Studies of Operations Research and the Management Sciences, Program Publication No. 8-71.

_____, "The Impact of Management Science on Political Decision Making," presented at the 66th Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Los Angeles, Sept. 8-12, 1970.

Wholley, Joseph S., "What Can We Actually Get From Program Evaluation," Policy Sciences, Vol. 3, 1972, pp. 361-369.

Wildavsky, Aaron, "The Self-Evaluating Organization," Public Administration Review, Vol. 32, No. 5, September-October, 1972, pp. 509-520.

Windle, Charles and Peter Bates, "Evaluating Program Evaluations," in Evaluations of Behavioral Programs in Community, Residential, and School Settings, by Park O. Davidson and Franklin W. Clark, Champaign, Illinois, Research Press, 1974.

Young, Carlotta, J., "Evaluation Research," a paper presented at the Evaluation Research Society Second Annual Meeting, Washington, DC, November 2-4, 1978.

Zand, Dale E. and Richard E. Sorenson, "Theory of Change and the Effective Use of Managemet Science," Administrative Science Quarterly, Vo. 20, December, 1975, pp. 532-544.